



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/542,936      | 07/19/2005  | Byoung-Joo Gwag      | 110200.404USPC      | 5371             |

500 7590 06/09/2008  
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC  
701 FIFTH AVE  
SUITE 5400  
SEATTLE, WA 98104

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1649

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

06/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |   |                                    |  |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/542,936      | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>GWAG ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D. | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1649            |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/22/06; 1/8/07</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restriction***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group IIb (i.e., BDNF compositions) in the reply filed on 3/10/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "the unifying concept of pending claim 14 is the combination of a neurotrophin and a tetrafluorobenzyl derivative".

This is not found persuasive, because of the reasons previously made of record, and because each individual "neurotrophin" is not an obvious variant of any different neurotrophin, especially given the different receptors each neurotrophin binds and their unique functions on different populations of neurons. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims related to generic neurotrophins or to NGF, NT-3 and/or NT-4/5 (e.g., claims 14 & 15) are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 3/10/08.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

While the specification asserts a specific and substantial utility for the instant invention (e.g., pages 3-4, 8 & 30 of the specification), "*preventing* neuronal cell death" is not credible, because even normal aging results in death of neurons. Therefore, given the broadest reasonable

Art Unit: 1649

interpretation consistent with that disclosed within the specification for the recitation of “*preventing* neuronal cell death”, which requires no naturally occurring loss of even a single neuron, is not credible, by definition; especially as it relates to treating neurodegenerative disease states that are characterized by neuronal cell death that further have no known treatment. See MPEP 2107.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14-17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Additionally, Figure 16 demonstrates that a decrease in neuronal survival induced by BDNF is not completely obviated by administration of 2-hydroxy-TTBA, for example, because LDH efflux levels do not return to zero, and therefore, some neuronal cell death still occurs; thereby, not being “prevented” by definition.

4. Should Applicants amend the claims to remove the recitation of “preventing...”,

Claims 14-17 would then be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

Art Unit: 1649

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification describes the specific tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives of BAS, TBAS, NBAS, CBAS, MBAS, FBAS and 2-hydroxy-TTBA (e.g., see page 9 of the specification). No other “tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives” are described. No genus of “tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives” is described. Nor is any written description provided in the specification for what distinguishable functional or other structural characteristics these other generic polypeptides would possess. In other words, the claims do not require that the additional “tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives” possess any particular biological activity, nor any particular conserved structure to some base structure, nor any other disclosed distinguishing feature. To provide evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. Thus, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus of “tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives” because one skilled in the art can not structurally visualize what chemical structures would then possess “tetrafluorobenzyl derivatives” thereof; thereby, not reasonably meeting the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See MPEP 2163.

Art Unit: 1649

***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Stucker, can be reached on (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-7997 (toll-free).

/Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1649  
June 2, 2008